



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,006	04/17/2006	Yong-Min Lee	CU-4773 RJS	8807
26530 7590 12/10/2009				
LADAS & PARRY LLP				
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE				
SUITE 1600				
CHICAGO, IL 60604				
EXAMINER				
PATEL, MUNJALKUMAR C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/10/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/576,006

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Munjai Patel

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7, 9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-7, 9-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. **Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Karabinis (US PAT # 5,937,332)** herein after referred as **Karabinis**, in further view of **Lindenmeier et al. (US PG PUB # US 20020118138 A1)** herein after referred as **Lindenmeier**.

4. **Regarding claim 1, Karabinis** discloses an apparatus for repeating a downlink signal from a satellite to a mobile station in a shadow area (**Karabinis: Abstract & Fig 2-7, Column 1 lines [17-32] , [46-60], column 4 lines [61-67], Karabinis discloses repeating a downlink signal**), the apparatus comprising:

a receiving unit for receiving the downlink signal and amplifying the received downlink signal from the satellite (**Karabinis: Fig 2: 210 & Fig 3: 250 discloses receiving unit with amplifier that amplifies downlink signal received from satellite Fig 2:110**);

a radiating unit (**Karabinis: Column 5 lines [11]**) for radiating the amplified downlink signal to the shadow area (**Karabinis: Column 4 lines [65]**); and a feeding unit for feeding the amplified downlink signal to the radiating means (**Karabinis: Fig 2 & column 5 lines [6-21] describes the process where repeater receives downlink signal, amplifies it and retransmits to the mobile station which provides means for feeding the amplified downlink signal to the radiating means**),

wherein the radiating unit comprises:

a symmetrical dual transmitting antenna (**Karabinis: Fig 6 discloses both the antennas are coupled by a hinge, hence a dual transmitting antenna**) provided with

a first micro strip patch array antenna (**Karabinis: Fig 3: 210:185 Col 5 lines [48-54] discloses first antenna**) and a second micro strip patch array antenna (**Karabinis: Fig 3: 290:175 Col 5 lines [64] Col 6 line [8] discloses second antenna**); and

a divider for dividing the amplified downlink signal to a first portion and a second portion, and passing the first portion to the first micro strip patch array antenna and the second portion to the second micro strip patch array antenna (**Karabinis: Col 3 lines [27-30] discloses antenna isolation, hence a divider that isolates downlink signals between two antennas**),

Where the dual microstrip patch array antenna is used only as a transmitting antenna. **However, Karabinis** fails to explicitly state "symmetrical" dual transmitting antenna, however, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide Symmetrical dual transmitting antenna as taught by **Lindenmeier (Lindenmeier: Fig 3a- 4d discloses both the antennas are at certain angle position and symmetrical, hence a symmetrical dual transmitting antenna)**.

5. In a similar field of endeavor, **Lindenmeier** discloses Flat antenna for mobile satellite communication. In addition **Lindenmeier** disclose symmetrical dual transmitting antenna.
6. **Therefore**, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Karabinis** by specifically providing "symmetrical" dual antenna, for the purpose of receiving & transmitting proper signal.

7. **Regarding claim 2, Karabinis** in view of **Lindenmeier** discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the receiving unit comprises:

a micro-strip patch array antenna (**Karabinis: Fig 2: 210 is patch array antenna i.e. micro strip patch array antenna**) for receiving the signal from the satellite; and an amplifier for amplifying the received signal (**Karabinis: Fig 3:250 & 280**) from the micro-strip patch array antenna (**Karabinis: Fig 2: 210**). This claim is rejected for the same motivation as claim 1.

8. **Regarding claim 3, Karabinis** in view of **Lindenmeier** discloses the apparatus of claim 2, wherein the radiating unit is installed in the shadow area (**Karabinis: Column 4 lines [65]**). This claim is rejected for the same motivation as claim 2.

9. **Regarding claim 4, Karabinis** in view of **Lindenmeier** discloses the apparatus of claim 2, wherein the micro-strip patch array antenna (**Karabinis: Fig 2: 210**) and the amplifier (**Karabinis: Fig 3:250 & 280**) are implemented as one piece (**Karabinis: Fig 2 & 3**) and further comprises a probe (**Karabinis: Fig 3: connecting probe is between 170 to 250 & 280**) for transiting the signal received from the micro-strip patch array antenna to the amplifier. This claim is rejected for the same motivation as claim 2.

10. **Regarding claim 7, Karabinis** in view of **Lindenmeier** discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the receiving unit is located at a position where a line of sight to the

satellite (**Karabinis: Fig 2:110 & 210 are in line of sight**) is secured. This claim is rejected for the same motivation as claim 1.

11. **Regarding claim 6 & 9, Karabinis** in view of **Lindenmeier** discloses everything in claim 1 (Applicant has cancelled claim 5, hence the examiner is assuming claim 6 depending from claim 1), as above, however **Karabinis** in view of **Lindenmeier** fails to disclose apparatus's intended use specifically as shadow area being overpass or underpass. **However, the examiner** maintains that it was well known in the art at the time of invention to interpret shadow area as underpass or overpass.

Karabinis describes shadow area as signals into buildings, foliage, transportation vehicles, and other objects which can reduce link margin (**Karabinis: column 2 lines [6—65]**), it is obvious to one ordinary in the art to interpret it as underpass or overpass as in both situation it reduces link margin of the apparatus disclosed. This claim is rejected for the same motivation as claim 1.

12. **Regarding claim 10, Karabinis** in view of **Lindenmeier** discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the first micro strip patch array antenna and the second micro strip patch array antenna are coupled by a hinge (**Karabinis: Col 8 lines [1-17] discloses Flap or cover attached with a hinge between first and second antenna and as further shown in fig 6 both the antennas are coupled by a hinge**) to tilt a radiation angle of the symmetrical dual transmitting antenna (**Karabinis: Fig 6 discloses both the antennas are coupled by a hinge & hence at certain angle position it becomes**

symmetrical, hence a symmetrical dual transmitting antenna). This claim is rejected for the same motivation as claim 1.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/18/2009 have been fully considered but they are moot due to amendment to the claims.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Munjal Patel whose telephone number is (571)270-5541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 AM - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rafael Perez-Gutierrez can be reached on 571-272-7915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617